DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 256 CS 500 421

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | McEwen, William J.; Wiotbold, George H. |
| TITLE | Dimensions of Response to Public Service Drug Abuse Information. Drug Abuse Information Research Project. |
| INSTITUTION | Connecticut Univ., Storrs. Communication Research Program. |
| SPONS AGENCY | National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. |
| REPORT NO | DAIR-2 |
| PUB DATE | Apr 72 |
| NOTE | 23p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | College Students; *Drug Abuse; *Factor Analysis; *Information Dissemination; Information Theory; Mass Media; *Response Mode; Television; *Television Commercials; Television Research |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Drug Abuse Information Research Project (DAIR); Message Responses; Public Service Advertising |

ABSTRACT

One approach to the study of structures that underly receiver response to perceptual stimuli has been that of factor analysis. This method was used to study responses of 92 students at the University of Connecticut to drug abuse commercials. Responses to five anti-drug television commercials were categorized according to: (1) "relative persuasion," indicating a positive reaction to the general believability of the commercial; (2) "negative evaluation," indicating a rejection of the commercial; (3) "Creative stimulation," reflecting receivers' positive reactions to the originality, novelty, or aesthetic merits of the message; and (4) the "hard sell" response, producing measurable fear-arousal characterized as disturbing, forceful, or depressing. Results of the study verify the hypothesis that factor analysis can be used to identify subjects' response patterns to televised drug abuse messages. (RM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 082256

# DIMENSIONS OF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC SERVICE DRUG ABUSE INFORMATION

by

William J. McEwen
with George H. Wittbold

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
William J. McEwen
George H. Wittbold
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

April 1972

DRUG ABUSE INFORMATION RESEARCH PROJECT

DAIR Report #2

OS 500 421

This report is one of a series of descriptive and predictive studies into the cognitive, affective and behavioral responses to drug abuse information. Project DAIR (Drug Abuse Information Research), proposes to define dimensions of information seeking and utilization that relate to drug abuse. Investigations in this series develop and implement the instrumentation for a methodology which includes surveys, experimental manipulations, field experiments and modeling. One goal of the series is the development of a stochastic behavioral model which allows the prediction of drug use behavior consequent to specified exposure from drug abuse information.

Computer time for statistical analyses was provided through the Facilities of the University of Connecticut Computer Center and supported by National Science Foundation Grant GJ-9 to the Computer Center.

Not for publication. All rights reserved: may not be reproduced without permission of the authors. Reference and citation for noncommercial purposes permitted.

A complete list of available DAIR Reports is provided on the inside back cover.

# DIMENSIONS OF RESPONSE TO PUBLIC SERVICE DRUG ABUSE INFORMATION

by William J. McEwen with George H. Wittbold

## Introduction

One requisite component of any examination of receiver response to perceptual stimuli would seem to be a systematic examination of the range of responses exhibited. Any stimulus capable of being perceived will evidence a wide variety of perceptual reactions from judges of that stimulus. A determination of this set of varied responses should precede any attempt to evaluate or draw implications from the responses thus observed. This study represents an attempt to determine the range and structure of receiver judgments of a particular type of perceptual stimuli: drug abuse advertisements.

One approach typically employed in the examination of hypothetical simple structures underlying sets of perceptual responses has been that of factor analysis. Through the use of factor analytic tecnhiques a relatively large and complex matrix of interrelationships may be described via some smaller number of more general constructs. For example, in a classic set of studies, Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum (1957) employed factor analysis to examine the connotative meanings perceivers have for various verbal stimuli. The authors attempted to index the representational processes involved in the processing of language through the analysis of intercorrelational data obtained from judgmental responses to words (indexed by means of a seven-interval bipolar rating scale which the authors termed the "semantic differential"). A typical study cited by Osgood et al. reported data from 200 perceiver

judgments of each of 20 concepts on each of 50 semantic differential scales. Using the centroid method of factor analysis advocated by Thurstone (1947), the data yielded an underlying factor structure consisting of three major dimensions of "meaning" which the authors labelled Evaluation, Potency and Activity.

Additional examples of this approach may be found in research into the dimensions of response to communication sources (Berlo, Lemert and Mertz, 1970; McCroskey, 1966), the evaluation of radio newscasters (Williams, 1963), as well as the more specifically-oriented analyses of responses to written messages and product perceptions (e.g. Carroll, 1960; Bush, Brinton and Newell, 1957; McEwen, 1969). Most of these studies have employed subjective ratings by perceivers of some number of stimulus objects (sources; prose passages) by means of semantic differential type rating instruments. The semantic differential scale purportedly provides an apparent interval measure of judgmental stimuli along a continuous bipolar dimension (e.g. good-bad; nice-awful; abstract-concrete). Criticism of this approach to scaling concepts (e.g. Green and Goldfried, 1965; Heise, 1969; Kaplan, 1972) have emphasized the lack of universal bipolarity of scale end-points (e.g. "hot" may be the opposite of "cold" when "stove" is evaluated, but may be the opposite of "cool" when "jazz" is considered) and a resultant loss of the "neutral" midpoint of the scale and of scale intervality when end-points are not in fact equally distant from "meaninglessness" (for example, is "clear" as much above neutrality as "hazy" is below this point; is "tense" the opposite of "relaxed" or is "placid" the opposite of "vigorous" and do these terms represent equidistant departures from a neutral judgment on these scales?). Green and Goldfried (1965), for example, state that the true bipolarity of scalar end-points is dependent on the

concepts being evaluated and thus generalizability of a "bipolar" scale is dubious. Kaplan (1972) concludes that the "liking" and "disliking" components of attitude should be measured separately. Kaplan, along with a number of other researchers has employed modifications of the Osgood et al. approach to examining perceptual stimuli. In a series of studies bearing on the present investigation, for example, Leavitt and his associates (Leavitt, 1969; 1970; Wells, Leavitt and McConville, 1971) departed from the earlier semantic differential approach to measuring advertising perceptions (e.g. Mindak, 1955) in employing single descriptive terms to assess perceiver evaluations. Drawing from an initial pool of some 700 words, Leavitt (1969) eliminated all terms which were not frequently employed by sample respondents to describe commercials and also deleted all terms which could not provide discrimination between sample commercial stimuli. A resultant set of 71 words was applied to each of eleven commercials by independent sets of 20 to 30 viewers. Data were obtained regarding viewer judgments of the applicability of each of the terms and this data was then submitted to factor analysis. Six stable factors appeared to emerge: Humor (amusing; playful); Vigor (exciting; energetic); Sensuousness (tender; soothing); Uniqueness (imaginative; novel); Personal Relevance (valuable; meaningful for me); Irritation (terrible; stupid).

The factors of response reported by Leavitt apply, however, to persuasive television advertising for consumable products (the eleven commercials tested were for products such as washing machines, tuna fish and cereals). The generality of such findings to situations where advertising is aimed at the solution of a social problem (e.g. curbing pollution, alcoholism or drug abuse)

would hence of necessity be suspect. To the extent that the aims of such public service advertising differ from the aims of more general consumer product advertising, and to the extent that the needs of viewers/consumers in these two situations differ, one might expect to find dissimilar patterns of response to these message appeals. It would be anticipated, for example, that the "Humor" factor discussed at length by Wells, Leavitt and McConville (1971) as the most important single factor (accounting for almost twice as much total variance in ratings as the next most important factor) would take on much less importance in an area where humor is not an integral part of commercial strategy. A more general form of this factor -- some dimension associated with the general activity or energy level of the commercial -- might be expected to encompass the more specific humor dimension. In addition, that aspect of viewer response termed "Personal Relevance" might be expected to take on relatively greater importance in one's response to public service advertising where the addressed topic is one of personal salience. For a variety of audience members (students and teenagers as well as parents; drug users as well as non-users) drug abuse would appear to constitute a salient, ego-involving topic of current concern. Hence it would be anticipated that the crucial dimensions of response to this type of public service advertising might be, first, the apparent personal relevance of the commercial message and, secondarily perhaps, the stimulation quality of the advertising strategy.

Thus, bearing in mind the necessity for some understanding of the dimensions and range of perceptual response, it was felt that an investigation into the effectiveness of anti-drug abuse strategies must begin with a systematic examination of the reactions

exhibited by members of the intended target audiences. Since one of the major audience segments envisioned for drug abuse campaigns is the student population (Richards and Langer, 1971; Herzog, Sudia and Harwood, 1970), the present study focusses on developing a set of measures capable of parsimoniously describing the relevant responses exhibited by this particular audience.

## Methods

### Experimental Pretest

Subjects Students enrolled in four sections of an introductory communication course at the University of Connecticut (N = 92) participated in the pretest.

Materials Four filmed television commercials, obtained from the National Clearinghouse on Drug Abuse Information, were employed in the pretest. Films were selected on a judgmental basis from among those being employed at the time for television drug abuse information campaigns. Selection of the commercial stimuli was made with the goal of representing a range of types of appeals (e.g. celebrity endorsement; fear appeal) and a range of types of illicit drugs being addressed (speed; LSD; marijuana). All were 16 mm color sound films and were projected to subjects in classroom settings. A description of the films employed may be found in Appendix A.

Procedures Subjects were infomed that the Communication Division was currently engaged in research aimed at assessing student evaluations of drug related film clips. One of the four films was then shown to the subjects in the four classrooms (ranging in size from 16 to 28 students) after which subjects completed a self-administered questionnaire. In the questionnaire booklet, sunjects were asked to anonymously respond to two open-

ended questions which requested the subject to list as many words as possible which were felt to: 1) describe the film clip viewed (e.g. colorful; educational; boring; involving) and 2) describe the subject's personal reactions while viewing the film (e.g. confused; anxious; happy). Subject responses were tabulated and analyzed in order to assist in generating a word pool of relevant, spontaneously employed descriptive terms used in reacting to drug abuse commercials.

Pretest Results The pretest data indicated a total of 725 codable mentions of 375 different descriptive terms (chiefly single word descriptors) applicable to drug abuse advertisements. This constituted an average of approximately two mentions per word (range from one to 25) and approximately eight mentions per subject. Twelve descriptors which received at least eight total mentions (i.e. at least 1% of total mentions) were retained for the word pool. An additional 18 terms which had received from two to six mentions each and judgmentally appeared to express a range of evaluative response of pertinence to drug abuse information were added to the 12 terms which had satisfied the above criteria. A complete report of the pretest results may be found in Appendix B.

Factor Analysis Study

Subjects Subjects for the main body of the investigation consisted of five intact classes, separate from those used for the pretest, drawn from the available sections of the introductory communication course at the University of Connecticut. It was the intent of the study that a variety of respondents react to a variety of drug abuse commercials via a number of perceptual scales. While some systematic bias (type G error as discussed by Lindquist, 1953) might have affected the mean commercial ratings

in some single group, it seemed unlikely that the nature of the relationships between perceptual stimuli would have been systematically affected. Data were tabulated across all subjects (N = 114) across all commercials tested.

Materials Five commercials were employed as stimuli in the main factor analysis study (the original four included in the pretest plus one additional comparable film). Films were again projected via standard 16 mm sound equipment in classroom situations.

Questionnaire The questionnaire consisted of a number of one word or two word descriptor terms potentially applicable to the expression of perceiver response to drug abuse advertising. Thirty of the 82 descriptor terms comprising the questionnaire were obtained from the pretest results. An additional 16 terms were selected from the 52 terms used to constitute a set of similar evaluative scales reported by Leavitt (1970). Selections were based on apparent applicability of descriptor terms to drug abuse commercials (hence "warm," "merry" and "tender" were not considered obviously pertinent to drug abuse advertising while "convincing," "novel," "dull" and "worn out" were selected as appearing applicable). The remaining 36 terms selected for inclusion were derived from those descriptors employed in factor analytic investigations by Berlo, Lemert and Mertz (1970), Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum (1957) and from a descriptor word pool of 1000 terms reported by Wells, Leavitt and McConville (1971). Selection was again on a judgmental basis, obtaining inter-judge agreement among the experimenters regarding the potential items as well as the degree of apparent redundancy with descriptor terms already included.

Each descriptor word was accompanied in the questionnaire by a blank wherein the subject was instructed to place a number from

one to five, depending on the degree to which the term in question was perceived as applying to the particular film clip viewed (ranging from "applies extremely well" to "does not apply at all"). The complete questionnaire may be found in Appendix C.

Procedures Subjects were informed, as in the pretest, that the Communication Division was engaged in assessing student reactions to various drug related film clips. Subjects were shown one of the five films (group size ranging from 17 to 27 subjects) and were then asked to respond anonymously to the film via the structured questionnaire described above. Upon completion of the questionnaire, questions were answered and the general purpose of the study was explained.

Factor Analysis Procedures Data obtained in the experiment were subjected to correlational analysis and subsequent factor analysis employing a principal factors solution with communality estimates in the main diagonals and varimax rotation to a specified number of factors (Nie, Bent and Hull, 1970).

Due to core limitations on the University of Connecticut's IBM 360-65 computer, all 82 items could not be factor analyzed at one time. Instead, the results of two separate factor analyses of 50 items each (hence providing overlap on the 18 descriptors which appeared in both analyses) were combined to form a final pool of 66 descriptors which was then factor analyzed according to the same procedures specified above.

## Results

Factor analytic solutions were obtained in all cases employing the criterion that each factor must have at least three descriptor terms which loaded highly (at least .40) and purely (less than .30 on any other factor) in order that that factor be retained.

Altogether, three separate factor analyses were performed: one factor analysis on each of the two 50 item sets and a final factor analysis on the combined set of 66 terms. In all three instances, the above criterion resulted in a four factor solution.

Results from the analysis of the first 50 descriptor terms are reported in Table 1. All terms with loadings above .40 on a factor are reported. Of the 50 terms included in this analysis, nine (soothing, one-sided, confusing, unrealistic, ethical, distracting, relaxing, vigorous and sympathetic) did not load highly (a minimum of .40) on any factor.

Results of the second factor analysis of 50 items (the remaining 32 items not previously factor analyzed plus the last 18 items from the first factor analysis) are reported in Table 2. Results from the second partial factor analysis are in general agreement with those obtained from the first analysis. In addition to obtaining four factor solutions in each instance, both analyses reflected similar orderings of the factors in terms of relative importance. Factor I represented 56.3% of the total variance accounted for in the first analysis and represented 49.6% of total variance accounted for in the second analysis. Factor II accounted for 23.0% of the variance in the first analysis and 28.4% in the second. Factors III and IV accounted for 10.9% and 9.8% of total variance in the first analysis and 13.9% and 8.0% in the second analysis. The one common descriptor term included in both analysis which did not load highly on any factor in the first analysis (sympathetic) also did not load above .30 on any factor in the second analysis.

An additional seven terms did not load above .40 on any of the factors in the second analysis: subtle, seemed long, amusing,

preaching, light, superficial and concise. It was therefore decided to eliminate the total of 16 items in order to derive a word list of 66 meaningful descriptor terms which could then be simultaneously analyzed without exceeding computer capacity. Results of this final combined factor analysis also evidenced a four factor solution using the criteria previously mentioned. The results are reported in Table 3. Factor I represented 54.6% of the total variance accounted for. Factors II, III and IV represent 23.4%, 12.7% and 9.4% respectively. Eigenvalues associated with the four factors were, in order, 15.35, 6.58, 3.75 and 2.64.

Seven of the descriptor terms did not load above .40 on any dimension: repetitious, inconsistent, distracting, authoritative, ambiguous, fast moving and surprising. All but two, however (fast moving and authoritative) loaded between .36 and .39 on some single dimension.

Discussion

Generating labels for the four hypothetical dimensions resultant from the factor analysis is, of course, a rather arbitrary decision. Still, an examination of the descriptor terms loading highly on the factors seems to provide conceptual support for the following: Relevant Persuasion (Factor I); Negative Evaluation (Factor II); Creative Stimulation (Factor III); Hard Sell (Factor IV).

The Relevant Persuasion factor contains descriptor terms which in general indicate a positive reaction to drug abuse messages (e.g. sincere, frank, believable, honest, good, reasonable). These terms, however, appear to indicate a specific type of positive response related to the general believability of the commercial, apparently akin to the "safety" dimension of source evaluation discussed by Berlo et al. (1970). This positive response to the message appears

strongly tied to some indication that the message is seen as relevant to the receiver (meaningful, made sense) and as apparently persuasive (informative, convincing, effective).

Factor II (Negative Evaluation) is a general factor consisting of rather global negative responses to drug abuse information. Interestingly, the factor is independent of the first and third factors, although several of the items contained in the Negative Evaluation factor seem to indicate negative persuasiveness (absurd, impractical, exaggerated, deceptive) which intuitively should merely reflect the opposite of terms such as believable, reasonable and sincere. In addition, several of the terms on this factor (lifeless, worn out, dull, boring) would, on an intuitive basis, appear to constitute the negative pole of Factor III (unique, original, eye catching). This may provide additional evidence in support of those who caution against the assumption of necessary bipolarity based on the intuitive (or Thesaurus-assisted) selection of word "pairs" (see, for example, Kaplan, 1972).

The Creative Stimulation factor apparently reflects receiver perceptions of the uniqueness, novelty and originality of the message, though whether this judgment is based on the originality of the general message approach (e.g. "I never thought of myself as a junkie simply because I take diet pills and sleeping tablets") or whether this perception is rather a consequence of imaginative and creative commercial techniques (i.e. "style" as opposed to "content", cannot be precisely determined from the obtained data. There is some evidence to suggest that some aspect of approach ("content") is being evaluated, perhaps simultaneously, because of the inclusion of certain terms such as genuine and interesting which seem to reflect a concern with message approach extending beyond mere creative media

technology.

The final factor (Hard Sell) is comprised of a number of terms which might, at first thought, not be expected to be related. On this dimension were found terms which seem to index the fear-arousing nature of the message (scary, threatening) as well as the emotional impact of the message (emotional, forceful, distrubing, depressing). Despite the apparent negative tone of some of these descriptors, however, the factor also contains terms which suggest that some amount of effectiveness is perceived as well (thought provoking, persuasive, effective). Thus the general tone of the terms loading on this factor suggests perceptions of drug abuse messages which reflect a general "hard sell" approach to persuasion.

The labels applied to the four dimensions of receiver response to drug abuse advertising are of less importance than the potential for employing such an instrument to examine viewer perceptions of various drug abuse information strategies. Additional research aimed at determining the reliability and sensitivity of the instrument is of course required. Specific examinations should subsequently be addressed to examining the perceptual structure of various subpopulations to assess possible differences (e.g. does the relative importance of these factors hold constant for present drug users; is the same complexity of response evidenced for younger children; is the factor structure different for inner city youth?).

The ultimate test of the instrument's utility would of course rest on some determination of the predictive validity of data obtained from its application to drug abuse messages. Given that the instrument can be established as a stable yet sensitive index of perceptual judgments, the determination of the sorts of behaviors these judgments, separately or conjointly, are capable of predicting

will be the final validator. Future inquiry will thus attempt to employ correlational methods to examine behavioral concommitants of receiver perceptions. Future inquiry will also attempt to experimentally approach the validity question. For example, studies could examine those commercials seen as highly novel (high in Creative Stimulation) to determine whether behavioral indices of arousal or stimulation value (e.g. physiological measures such as GSR) substantiate the sorts of predictions made on the basis of perceptual judgments. The experimental validation of the pragmatic utility will serve as the final arbiter of factor "reality."

Table 1.

Analysis I Factor Loadings

| Factor I | | Factor II | | Factor III | | Factor IV | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Honest | .761 | Worn Out | .677 | Unique | .746 | Scary | .614 |
| Wise | .702 | Dull | .647 | Original | .712 | Depressing | .537 |
| Believable | .644 | Boring | .587 | Creative | .652 | Forceful | .495 |
| Informative | .631 | Disorgan'd | .527 | Novel | .573 | Biased | .494 |
| Frank | .625 | Wishy Washy | .517 | *Genuine | .487 | Opinionated | .471 |
| Reliable | .584 | Impractical | .506 | *Effective | .441 | Authoritative | .427 |
| Meaningful | .577 | Lifeless | .494 | *Convincing | .437 | *Aggravating | .427 |
| Reasonable | .562 | Repetitious | .422 | Exciting | .407 | Exaggerated | .400 |
| Worth Remember'g | .562 | *Aggravating | .421 | | | | |
| *Convincing | .558 | Hesitant | .406 | | | | |
| Sincere | .546 | | | | | | |
| *Genuine | .476 | | | | | | |
| Phony | -.453 | | | | | | |
| Helpful | .451 | | | | | | |
| Inconsist't | -.434 | | | | | | |
| *Effective | .428 | | | | | | |
| Strong | .426 | | | | | | |
| Persuasive | .400 | | | | | | |

* indicates impure loading (item loaded above .40 on another facto

Table 3.

Combined Factor Analysis
(66 items)

| Factor I | | Factor II | | Factor III | | Factor IV | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Made Sense | .845 | Worn Out | .736 | Different | .750 | Scary | .689 |
| Honest | .747 | Overdone | .709 | Unique | .722 | Threatening | .619 |
| Frank | .689 | Worthless | .635 | Original | .714 | Disturbing | .589 |
| Educational | .673 | Aggravating | .619 | Creative | .684 | Emotional | .582 |
| Believable | .657 | Dull | .618 | Novel | .531 | Depressing | .572 |
| Wise | .650 | Absurd | .580 | Clear | .524 | Forceful | .566 |
| Factual | .649 | Impractical | .556 | *Interesting | .520 | Thought Provoking | .537 |
| Informative | .641 | Boring | .555 | Eye Catching | .478 | *Persuasive | .433 |
| Meaningful | .591 | Exaggerated | .550 | Genuine | .471 | *Effective | .410 |
| Sincere | .583 | Lifeless | .522 | *Exciting | .414 | *Exciting | .403 |
| Convincing | .572 | Biased | .521 | | | | |
| Easy to Understand | .566 | Wishy Washy | .515 | | | | |
| Good | .548 | Childish | .513 | | | | |
| Reliable | .537 | Irritating | .497 | | | | |
| Truthful | .517 | Deceptive | .490 | | | | |
| *Effective | .473 | Typical | .480 | | | | |
| Reasonable | .471 | Helpful | -.462 | | | | |
| Revealing | .469 | *Worth Remembering | -.426 | | | | |
| Strong | .459 | Hesitant | .426 | | | | |
| *Worth Remembering | .453 | *Phony | .414 | | | | |
| Blunt | .439 | Opinionated | .407 | | | | |
| *Interesting | .425 | | | | | | |
| *Phony | -.404 | | | | | | |
| *Persuasive | .400 | | | | | | |

* indicates impure loading (item loaded above .40 on another factor)

## References


Berlo, D.K., J.B. Lemert and R.J. Mertz Dimensions for evaluating the acceptability of message sources. Public Opinion Quarterly 1970, 33, 563-576.

Brinton, J.E., C.R. Bush and T.M.M. Newell The newspaper and its public: a standardized test to measure the public's attitude toward a newspaper. Stanford: Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University, 1957.

Carroll, J.B. Vectors of prose style. In T.A. Sebeok (Ed.) Style In Language Cambridge, Mass: the MIT Press, 1960, 283-292.

Green, R.F. and M.R. Goldfried On the bipolarity of semantic space. Psychological Monographs, 1965, 79.

Heise, D.R. Some methodological issues in semantic differential research. Psychological Bulletin, 1969, 72, 406-422.

Kaplan, K.J. On the ambivalence-indifference problem in attitude theory and measurement: a suggested modification of the semantic differential technique. Psychological Bulletin, 1972, 77, 361-372.

Leavitt, W.C. Dimensions of communication: commercial perception scales. Research Department monograph, Leo Burnett Company, Chicago, 1969.

Leavitt, W.C. A multidimensional set of rating scales for television commercials. Journal of Applied Psychology, 54, 427-429.

Lindquist, E.F. Design and Analysis of Experiments in Psychology and Education, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1953.

McCroskey, J.C. Scales for the measurement of ethos. Speech Monographs, 1966, 33, 65-72.

McEwen, W.J. Concept testing. Research Department monograph, Leo Burnett Company, Chicago, 1969.

Mindak, W.A. Measuring Advertising Effectiveness From a Communications Point of View. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois, 1955.

Nie, N.H., D.H. Bent and C.H. Hull Statistical Package for the Social Sciences New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Osgood, C.E., G.J. Suci and P.H. Tannenbaum The Measurement of Meaning Urbana, ILL: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Richards, L.G. and J.E. Langer Drug-Taking in Youth U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Thurstone, L.L. Multiple-Factor Analysis Chicago: University of Chigo Press, 1947.

U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare Youth Reporters Discuss "Problem" Drugs Youth Reports No. 2 (E. Herzog, C.E. Sudia and J. Harwood), 1970.

Wells, W.D., W.C. Leavitt and M. McConville A reaction profile for TV commercials. Journal of Advertising Research, 1971, 11, 11-17.

Williams, F. A factor analysis of judgments of radio newscasters. Journal of Broadcasting, 1963, 7, 135-144.

# APPENDIX A

Drug Abuse Commercial Stimuli

Film Number 1: "LSD Wonder Drug" is a 60 second color film showing Rod Serling talking about the effects of LSD

Film Number 2: "Bill Cosby Talks About Speed" is a 30 second color fil showing Bill Cosby talking about the dangers of "speed."

Film Number 3: "The Truth About Marijuana" is a 60 second color film narrated by Rod Serling in which marijuana and the penalties for its use are discussed.

Film Number 4: "Bad Trip" is a 60 second color film narrated by Rod Serling and depicting the effects of a bad "trip" on LSD.

Film Number 5: "Neighborhood Junkie" is a 30 second color film narrated by Rod Serling in which the drug-taking habits of the typical neighborhood resident are discussed.

# APPENDIX B

Pretest Results

| Descriptor term | No. of Mentions | Descriptor term | No. of mentions |
|---|---|---|---|
| aware | 4 | ineffective | 3 |
| anxious | 15 | indifferent | 8 |
| amused | 3 | informative | 10 |
| attentive | 3 | lively | 2 |
| angry | 3 | misleading | 3 |
| ambiguous | 2 | meaningful | 2 |
| believable | 24 | one sided | 4 |
| boring | 26 | preaching | 2 |
| biased | 8 | propagandistic | 2 |
| brief | 3 | poor | 3 |
| blunt | 2 | quick | 3 |
| colorful | 15 | realistic | 8 |
| confusing | 11 | relaxed | 3 |
| concerned | 7 | revealing | 3 |
| concise | 2 | redundant | 3 |
| common | 2 | short | 21 |
| childish | 2 | surprised | 3 |
| distorted | 2 | scary | 3 |
| disappointed | 6 | superficial | 2 |
| distracted | 2 | truthful | 6 |
| educational | 14 | thought provoling | 3 |
| effective | 3 | to the point | 4 |
| enlightening | 2 | tasteless | 3 |
| eye catching | 3 | typical | 4 |
| exaggerated | 2 | threatening | 2 |
| emotional | 2 | unimpressive | 4 |
| factual | 15 | unhappy | 4 |
| frightened | 7 | uninterested | 4 |
| fast moving | 2 | uninformative | 4 |
| good | 11 | unbelievable | 3 |
| helpful | 7 | unclear | 2 |
| happy | 3 | vague | 2 |
| honest | 4 | worried | 3 |
| interesting | 25 | worthless | 2 |

--- all other descriptor terms were used only by one person and hence are not included in this list.

# FILM REACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

There is no need to put your name on this questionnaire — all answers will remain anonymous. Please indicate how well you personally feel each of the words listed below describes the film clip you have just seen.

If you feel that the word fits the film:

| | |
|---|---|
| extremely well | - place a 5 on the line to the right of the word. |
| very well | - place a 4 on the line |
| fairly well | - place a 3 on the line |
| not very well | - place a 2 on the line |
| does not apply at all | - place a 1 on the line |

Place a number next to each word:
(NOTE: disregard the numbers in parentheses next to each word. These are for coding purposes only)

repetitious _____(4)

soothing _____(5)

inconsistent _____(6)

one-sided _____(7)

persuasive _____(8)

reasonable _____(9)

worth remembering _____(10)

boring _____(11)

phony _____(12)

helpful _____(13)

novel _____(14)

confusing _____(15)

effective _____(16)

impractical _____(17)

disorganized8 _____(18)

worn out _____(19)

unique _____(20)

meaningful _____(21)

lifeless _____(22)

unrealistic _____(23)

frank _____(24)

forceful _____(25)

ethical _____(26)

distracting _____(27)

convincing _____(28)

dull _____(29)

depressing _____(30)

wise _____(31)

relaxing _____(32)

genuine _____(33)

creative _____(34)

vigorous _____(35)

biased _____(36)

hesitant _____(37)

scary _____(38)

exciting _____(39)

believable _____(40)

informative _____(41)

strong _____(42)

sympathetic _____(43)

reliable _____(44)

opinionated _____(45)

wishy-washy _____(46)

authoritative _____(47)

aggravating _____(48)

original _____(49)

sincere _____(50)

subtle _____(51)

honest _____(52)

exaggerated _____(53)

absurd _____(54)

blunt _____(55)

ambiguous _____(56)

made sense _____(57)

different _____(58)

threatening _____(59)

interesting _____(60)

irritating _____(61)

overdone _____(62)

easy to understand _____(63)

disturbing _____(64)

good _____(65)

deceptive _____(66)

colorful _____(67)

educational _____(68)

seemed long _____(69)

amusing _____(70)

factual _____(71)

typical _____(72)

childish _____(73)

eye-catching _____(74)

fast moving _____(75)

emotional _____(4)

worthless _____(5)

revealing _____(6)

truthful _____(7)

surprising _____(8)

thought provoking _____(9)

preaching _____(10)

enlightening _____(11)

superficial _____(12)

concise _____(13)

What did the film tell you to do (what to do and where to go) to find out more about drugs and drug abuse?

_____

_____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH!!